

It is extremely important from several perspectives that small ISP service providers continue to work within the line network inherited by SBC and provide full internet connectivity.

(1) My ability to complete my work at home requires the types of service (fixed IP)

very conveniently provided by small ISP services like my own, sonic.net

If this is not provided, there will be no recourse, as my work is for a federal government

agency and I will have no way to influence them to comply with SBC's requirements (at least those made available at reasonable cost ... costing is not based on actual expenses

for SBC but by pure marketing considerations. A public asset like the continued use

of Pacific Bell easements must be recognized by SBC and not made subject to monopolistic pricing.

(b) My private use of the internet connection also requires independence from arbitrary pricing structures and "convenience"-rules imposed by SBC.

In fact, I regard such access as a first amendment right in the 21st century.

(c) SBC will (sadly) find that single-provider pricing and service mandates are not

in their best interest, as I will immediately seek to transfer internet connectivity

to means that are currently not so appealing or price-effective.

Please do pass on to SBC the comment that the proposed monopolization of twisted-pair telephone line connectivity is not in their financial interest.

I have already cut off SBC-direct service once when the options that they provided, upon takeover of a smaller ISP, proved insufficient and their marketing

proved repulsive ... they acted as if they just owned me.

Robert Chatfield